D R A F T

Fort George G. Meade
Electric and Natural Gas
Utility Systems Privatization
Environmental Assessment

March, 2000

Attachment to Request For Proposal
for the Privatization of the
National Capital Region
Utility Distribution and Collection Systems
Solicitation DACA31-00-R-0026

Note: This file includes text only for the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Ft. Meade E&G UDC Systems Privatization. Information for Appendix A – Agency Coordination, Appendix B – General Installation Maps, and Appendix C – E&G UDC Systems Maps is provided as a separate file attachment to this Solicitation.

Prepared By:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Baltimore District

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This Environmental Assessment (EA) examines the proposed privatization of selected utility distribution (UDC) systems at Fort Meade, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, following the Department of Defense (DoD) and Department of the Army (DA) directives and guidance to military installations. DoD and DA envision that the Government will be able to divest itself of the ownership and responsibility to operate and maintain UDC systems on military installations by contracting with a non-Federal entity. The Military District of Washington (MDW) has decided to pursue this privatization initiative by grouping selected UDC systems at each of its five installations in the National Capital Region (NCR), and combining all grouped systems into one public solicitation. At Fort Meade, the utilities selected for the grouped contract are the electric and natural gas (Meade E&G UDC) systems. Initiative to privatize the water and wastewater UDC systems at Fort Meade will be handled separately.. MDW's decision to group the NCR UDC systems for privatization is the result of preliminary market research and conditions inventories at each of the five installations. These investigations have led to the conclusion that the responsibility to own, operate, and maintain unprofitable or marginally profitable systems would not be enticing to a non-Federal entity without proper incentives. The best incentive that MDW has envisioned, maximizing the extent of privatization, is to group all types of UDC systems from a number of locations into one package that combines the more potentially profitable utility systems with the less potentially profitable systems.

Actions Analyzed

Four alternatives were considered for this project. Alternatives for the proposed action include (1) Out-source Operation and Maintenance of the Meade E&G UDC Systems, (2) Privatization Restricted to the Current Alignments of the Meade E&G UDC Systems, (3) Unrestricted Privatization of the Meade E&G UDC Systems, and (4) the No-Action Alternative.

Alternative 1 would outsource the operation and maintenance of the Meade E&G UDC systems. The Government would retain ownership of the real property infrastructure and would continue to be responsible for any capital improvements to the systems. Adoption of Alternative 1 would not satisfy the need to provide immediate and future capital improvements to UDC systems in poor condition, nor would it fully comply with DoD and DA policy to divest Government ownership and operation of these systems.

Alternative 2 would privatize the Meade E&G UDC systems by means of fee simple transfer of current real property infrastructure to the non-Federal entity via a Bill of Sale or deed transaction. Additionally, an easement would be granted to the same entity for means of access along the current utility alignments, and a 10 to up to 50-year utility services contract would be awarded to transfer responsibility for maintenance and operation of these systems from the Government to the successful non-Federal entity. Adoption of Alternative 2 would restrict the non-Federal entity from proposing infrastructure construction and improvement activities outside the limits of the easement granted; therefore, no new work could be conducted on lands that

potentially have not already or recently been disturbed by human activities. It should be noted that adoption of Alternative 2 would allow the non-Federal entity to proceed expeditiously with infrastructure improvement activities within the limits of the easements to be granted upon contract award. However, possible monetary and operational efficiencies that could be achieved by the realignment of obsolete utility lines would not be realized. The potential benefit of initial project timesaving is not expected to outweigh these considerable opportunity costs.

Alternative 3 would privatize the Meade E&G UDC systems as in Alternative 2 above, except that no restrictions would be placed on the non-Federal entity to propose infrastructure construction or improvement activities outside the limits of easements to be granted for existing UDC systems. The non-Federal entity would be responsible to operate and maintain the UDC systems to industry or other standards as prescribed in the utility service contract. Should the non-Federal entity propose to replace part or all of an existing UDC system or systems, by realignment or relocation outside of the easement to be granted at contract award, the non-Federal entity would be responsible for all associated environmental compliance, permits, installation approvals, and local regulatory requirements. The non-Federal entity must fund these associated activities and complete them prior to initiation of any physical work. Adoption of Alternative 3 would allow the most unrestricted competition among offerors, encouraging the submission of proposals with the most efficient and cost-effective infrastructure improvement plans to serve the current and expected installation utility service needs. As Alternative 3 best positions MDW to be able to pursue DoD and DA UDC system privatization goals, it is designated as the preferred action alternative.

Alternative 4, the no-action alternative, is the baseline against which the proposed action was evaluated, as prescribed by Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations. The baseline established to evaluate the environmental and socioeconomic effects of the proposed action would be the conditions at Fort Myer in the absence of the proposed action. Adoption of the no-action alternative would continue the Government's present ownership and responsibilities to operate and maintain the existing Meade E&G UDC systems. Maintenance and operational trends would most likely remain the same. This alternative would not satisfy the need to provide near-term capital improvements to existing systems in poor condition, nor would it comply with DoD and DA policy on obtaining cost-effective and efficient utility services. Therefore, this alternative is not preferred.

Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences

Table ES-1 shows the expected impacts for the preferred action and no-action alternatives analyzed in detail in this EA. The following paragraphs provide additional information on expected impacts. The proposed action to privatize the ownership, operation and maintenance of the Meade E&G UDC systems would not be expected to have any significant adverse effects on any environmental resources or socioeconomic conditions on this installation. Furthermore, the proposed action would not be expected to significantly change the overall mission of Fort Meade, or by itself lead to an increase, decrease, or change in the number or types of tenants on the installation.

Granting of utility easements and transfer of the real property infrastructure would be expected to result in minimal cumulative physical, biological or chemical effects on any resource of the installation, and on installation command or mission. The only foreseeable effects of the proposed action on these resources are secondary and short-term. These effects would include potential excavation and construction activities by the non-Federal entity, or its subcontractors, associated with the repairing, upgrading or constructing of new UDC systems. The following segments address these potential effects.

Potential utility infrastructure improvements, including expansion, repair or upgrade of the UDC systems, would most likely have minimal impact on air, land and water resources. These effects are not likely to be large, either singly or cumulatively. Additionally, restrictions and conditions incorporated into the easement would require special care and responsibilities for environmentally sensitive areas, mitigating any foreseeable impacts to (1) water supply and quality, (2) prime farmland soils, (3) forest conservation areas, (4) aquatic resources, (5) wetlands, (6) threatened and endangered species, and (7) cultural resources. This reduction of the impact of each part of the proposed action would reduce the overall cumulative impact of all foreseeable activities within reasonable limits. The non-Federal entity would be responsible for ensuring that future construction, maintenance, and upgrades of the utilities comply with all applicable Federal and state environmental laws and regulations.

Regulatory Requirements

Compliance with Federal environmental regulations would be required before the project analyzed in this EA could be initiated. The status of environmental compliance for the installation is summarized in Table ES-2.

Conclusions

Upon reviewing the EA and other information, implementing the preferred alternative for the proposed action addressed in this EA would not significantly alter baseline environmental or socioeconomic conditions. Because the proposed action would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, no environmental impact statement will be prepared, and a Finding of No Significant Impact will be published in accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1500 and Army Regulation (AR) 200-2.

Table ES-1. Summary of Effects of Proposed Actions and Alternatives

Resource	Proposed Action	No-Action Alternative
Land Use	No Impact.	No Impact.
Geology	No Impact.	No Impact.
Soils	No Impact.	No Impact.
Topography and Drainage	No Impact.	No Impact.
Climate	No Impact.	No Impact.
Air Quality	No Impact.	No Impact.
Water Quality	No Impact.	No Impact.
Aquatic Resources and Wetlands	No Impact.	No Impact.
Vegetation	No Impact.	No Impact.
Wildlife Resources	No Impact.	No Impact.
Threatened and Endangered Species	No Impact.	No Impact.
Prime and Unique Farmlands	No Impact.	No Impact.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No Impact.	No Impact.
Cultural Resources	No Impact.	No Impact.
Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Substances	No Impact.	No Impact.
Infrastructure	No Impact.	No Impact.
Solid Waste	No Impact.	No Impact.
Transportation	Temporary, minor impacts.	No Impact.
Economics	Minor impacts.	No Impact.
Public Health and Safety	No Impact.	No Impact.
Noise	No Impact.	No Impact.
Environmental Justice	No Impact.	No Impact.

Table ES-2. Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a]

Acts	Compliance[b]
Anadromous Fish Conservation Act	FULL
Clean Air Act, as amended (Public Law 88-206)	FULL
Clean Water Act, as amended (Public Law 95-217)	FULL
Coastal Barrier Resources Act	FULL
Coastal Zone Management Act	FULL
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986	FULL
Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Public Law 93-205)	FULL
Estuary Protection Act	FULL
Federal Water Project Recreation Act	FULL
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 661, et seq.)	FULL
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act	FULL
Marine Mammal Protection Act	FULL
Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended (Public Law 94-265)	FULL
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190)	Ongoing
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Public Law 89-665)	Ongoing
Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended	FULL
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Public Law 94-580)	FULL
Rivers and Harbors Act	FULL
Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (Public Law 93-523)	FULL
Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, as amended	FULL
Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-469)	FULL
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1101, et seq.)	FULL
Wetlands Conservation Act (Public Law 101-233)	Ongoing
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act	FULL

[a] Applies to all alternatives.

[b] Ongoing--Some requirements of the regulation remain to be met before implementing some activities. Full compliance is expected.

TABLE ES-2, continued
Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a]

Executive Orders	
Flood Plain Management (Executive Order 11988)	FULL
Protection of Wetlands (Executive Order 11990)	Ongoing
Federal Compliance with Pollution Standards (Executive Order 12088)	FULL
Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Executive Order 12898)	FULL
Invasive Species (Executive Order 13112)	FULL

[a]Applies to all alternatives.

[b]Ongoing--Some requirements of the regulation remain to be met before implementing some activities. Full compliance is expected.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**
1.0 PURPOSE , NEED AND SCOPE 10
1.1 Background 10
1.2 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action 11
1.3 Scope of Analysis 11
1.4 Public Involvement 12
1.5 Framework for Analysis 12
2.0 PROPOSED ACTION 16
3.0 ALTERNATIVES 17
3.1 Out-Source Operation and Maintenance of Meade E&G UDC Systems 17
3.2 Privatization Restricted to the Current Alignments of the Meade E&G UDC Systems 17
3.3 Unrestricted Privatization of Meade E&G UDC Systems 18
3.4 The No-Action Alternative 18
4.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 19
4.1 Project Area Description 19
4.1.1 Land Use 19
4.1.2 Geology 19
4.1.3 Soils 19
4.1.4 Topography and Drainage 20
4.1.5 Climate 20
4.2 Air Quality 20
4.3 Water Quality 21
4.3.1 Surface Water 21
4.3.2 Groundwater 22
4.4 Aquatic Resources and Wetlands 22
4.4.1 Aquatic Resources 22
4.4.2 Wetlands 23
4.5 Vegetation 23
4.6 Wildlife Resources 24
4.7 Threatened and Endangered Species 24
4.8 Prime and Unique Farmlands 24
4.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers 26
4.10 Cultural Resources 26
4.10.1 Previous Investigations 26
4.10.2 Archeological Resources 26
4.10.3 Architectural Resources 27
4.11 Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Substances (HTRS) 28
4.11.1 Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) and Above-Ground Storage Tanks (ASTs) 28
4.11.2 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) 28
4.11.3 Radon 29
4.11.4 Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) 29
4.11.5 Lead-Based Paint (LBP) 30
4.11.6 Pesticides, Herbicides, and Fertilizers 30

4.11.7 Storage of Hazardous Materials 30
4.11.8 Contaminated Areas 30
4.12 Infrastructure 31
4.12.1 Electrical Distribution System Description and Requirements 31
4.12.2 Natural Gas Utility Distribution System Description and Requirements 32
4.12.3 Solid Waste 33
4.12.4 Traffic and Transportation 33
4.13 Socioeconomic Conditions 34
4.13.1 Demographics 34
4.13.2 Economics 34
4.13.3 Schools, Libraries, and Recreation Facilities 35
4.13.4 Public Health and Safety 36
4.13.5 Noise 36
4.13.6 Visual and Aesthetic Values 37
4.14 Environmental Justice 37
5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 41
5.1 Project Area 42
5.1.1 Geology 42
5.1.2 Soils 42
5.1.3 Topography and Drainage 42
5.2 Air Quality 42
5.3 Water Quality 43
5.4 Vegetation 43
5.5 Wildlife Resources 43
5.6 Cultural Resources 43
5.6.1 Archeological Resources 44
5.6.2 Architectural Resources 44
5.7 Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Substances (HTRS) 44
5.8 Infrastructure 44
5.8.1 Utilities 44
5.8.2 Traffic and Transportation 45
5.9 Socioeconomic Conditions 45
5.9.1 Economics 45
5.9.2 Public Health and Safety 46
5.9.3 Noise 46
5.9.4 Visual and Aesthetic Values 47
5.10 Cumulative Impacts 47
5.10.1 Impacts on the Natural Environment 47
5.10.2 Impacts on the Human Environment 48
6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS 50
7.0 REFERENCES 54

Appendix A – Agency Coordination (*in progress*)
Appendix B – General Installation Maps
Appendix C – UDC System Maps

D R A F T

Attachment to Solicitation DACA31-00-R-0026

Tables and Figures

Table **Page**

Table 1-1. Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a] 14
Table 4-1. Prime and Unique Farmland Soils on Fort Meade 25
Table 4-2: Fort Meade Historic District List of Buildings 27
Table 4-3: Minority and Low-Income Statistics for Fort Meade Area 39
Table 6-1. Summary of Effects of Proposed Actions and Alternatives 50

Figure **Location**

Fig. 1: Fort Meade Location Map ..... Appendix B
Fig. 2: Fort Meade Installation Map ..... Appendix B
Fig. 3: Land Use Areas ..... Appendix B
Fig. 4: Wetlands, Floodplains and Aquatic Resources ..... Appendix B
Fig. 5: Forest Conservation Areas ..... Appendix B
Fig. 6: Habitat Protection Areas
And Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species ..... Appendix B
Fig. 7: Proposed Historical District ..... Appendix B

1.0 PURPOSE , NEED AND SCOPE

1.1 Background

The great majority of the nation's military installations contain Government-owned, operated and maintained utility distribution and collection (UDC) systems. In many instances, funding for maintenance and operation of UDC systems has not kept pace with the functional needs of these individual systems over the years, especially in those systems which have exceeded or are now approaching the end of their expected useful life. Privatization of the UDC systems on military installations is envisioned as a mechanism to transfer ownership, operation, and maintenance, and infrastructure repair or replacement responsibilities from the Government to a private or public sector utility services entity. Privatization of the UDC systems is seen as the means for the military services to obtain the most cost efficient delivery of utility services and most effective maintenance of these systems to standards applicable and prescribed for private sector systems. Privatization of UDC systems would also allow the military services to transfer or otherwise redirect specific manpower resources to meet critical needs of its core training, support, and readiness missions.

Congressional legislation, subsequent Department of Defense (DoD) Defense Reform Initiative directives, and Department of the Army (DA) implementing policy, directed military installations to pursue privatizing all of UDC systems, except in those cases where a particular system is needed for unique national security reasons, or where privatization is determined to be uneconomical. As part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 10 U.S.C. §2688, the utility systems conveyance authority states, that the Secretary of a military department may convey a utility system, or part of an utility system, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary to a municipal, private, regional, district, or cooperative utility company or other entity. The conveyance may consist of all rights, title, and interest of the United States in the utility system or such lesser estate as the Secretary considered appropriate to serve the interests of the United States.

DoD issued Defense Reform Initiative Directive (DRID #9), Privatizing Utility Systems, on 10 December 1997. DRID #9 directed the military services to develop plans to privatize all applicable UDC systems by 1 January 2000. DoD relaxed the privatization deadline to 2003 for the great majority of UDC installation systems where privatization efforts had not yet been undertaken, per DRID #49, issued 23 December 1998. Following DA policy for implementing these DRIDs, the U.S. Army Military District of Washington (MDW) is seeking to privatize 13 selected UDC systems at its five installations in the National Capital Region (NCR) by the end of September 2000. The five NCR installations include: Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C.; Fort George G. Meade, Maryland; and Fort Myer, Fort Belvoir, and Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to address the environmental and socio-economic impacts of the proposed action to privatize, as a group, the electric and natural gas UDC systems at Fort Meade (Meade E&G UDC systems). See Appendix B, Figure 1: Location of Fort Meade; and Figure 2: Installation Map. Fort George G. Meade encompasses approximately 5,500 acres and is located within Anne Arundel County, Maryland. The Government is currently considering privatizing the water and wastewater UDC systems at Fort

Meade as well, but as this potential action would also involve a transfer of real property, which would entail a separate initiative. Water and Wastewater systems though are included as part of the collection of thirteen (13) UDC systems considered for privitization at Fort Myer, Ft. McNair, and Ft. Belvoir, since water and wastewater treatment at those installations is conducted off Federal property, and any privitization effort involving these systems would not involve real property transfers.

1.2 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the proposed action is to transfer infrastructure ownership from the Federal Government to a non-Federal entity to renovate, repair or replace the Meade E&G UDC systems, and to transfer the responsibility to operate and maintain these systems to prescribed industry standards, common to the private non-federal sector. The physical condition of the Meade E&G UDC systems are such that all or parts of the systems are approaching, or have exceeded, their expected useful life. Funding for maintenance, repair and upgrade of these systems provided by DA over the years has generally not kept pace with the need for adequately maintaining the infrastructure integrity and reliability of these systems.

MDW seeks to implement the proposed action by means of best value competitive award of a contract to a successful, non-Federal offeror. The successful offeror would own the Meade E&G UDC systems infrastructure in fee simple, and be granted easements to these existing UDC systems so as to be able to effect infrastructure repairs or replacement. Furthermore, the offeror would be responsible to operate and maintain these systems through a utility service contract of 10-year duration, as authorized by current Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) statute.

MDW is the major Army command ultimately responsible for overseeing all activities at its Fort Meade installation, has decided that the best means for implementing DoD and DA privatization policy is to consolidate privatization actions for 13 selected UDC systems at its five NCR installations. As described, for Fort Meade, the electric and natural gas UDC systems are grouped as part of the overall MDW privatization initiative. MDW has determined that grouping selected UDC systems by installation would be the most effective way: (1) to support the proposed action and (2) to comply with the DoD directives and DA guidance to privatize all UDC systems to the extent economical and non-injurious to national security. MDW determined that one or more of its UDC systems at various installations, if pursued separately for privatization, might not be viable for takeover by prospective offerors given the specifics of present condition, routing, and potential for profitably serving its customer base. By grouping selected UDC systems at its NCR installations into one privatization initiative, those utility systems with greater potential profitability would be combined with those systems envisioned as having lesser potential profitability. MDW seeks to cultivate an apparent, growing competitive interest in the non-Federal sector for not only this potential business opportunity on its five NCR installations, but also for more than 1,000 potentially applicable UDC systems DoD-wide.

1.3 Scope of Analysis

This EA was developed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), implementing regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), and Army Regulation (AR) 200-2, *Environmental Effects of Army Actions*. The purpose of this EA is to

inform decision-makers, and the public, of the likely environmental and socioeconomic consequences of the proposed action and alternatives.

The EA identifies, documents and evaluates the potential environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with the proposed action to implement DoD and Army privatization policy at Fort Meade. Section 2.0 describes the proposed action. Section 3.0 sets forth alternatives to the proposed action, including a no-action alternative, and explains why certain alternatives will not be evaluated in detail. Section 4.0 describes the existing environmental conditions at Fort Meade that fall within the scope of this EA. Section 5.0 describes the environmental and socio-economic consequences envisioned by adoption of either the proposed action or the no-action alternative. Section 6.0 presents the conclusions and findings.

An interdisciplinary team of environmental scientists, biologists, ecologists, planners, economists, engineers, historians, and military technicians has reviewed the proposed action and the alternatives in light of existing conditions and identified the relevant beneficial and adverse effects associated with the action. The EA focuses on effects likely to occur within the area of proposed action (i.e., the installation boundaries). The document analyzes direct effects (those resulting from the proposed action and occurring at the same time and place) and indirect effects (those resulting from the proposed action and occurring later in time or those farther removed in distance, but still reasonably foreseeable). The potential for cumulative effects is also addressed, and mitigation measures are identified where appropriate.

1.4 Public Involvement

MDW and Fort Meade invite public participation throughout the NEPA process. Consideration of the views and information of all interested persons promotes open communications and enables better decision-making. All agencies, organizations and members of the public having a potential interest in the proposed action are urged to participate.

Public participation opportunities with respect to the proposed action evaluated in this EA are guided by AR 200-2, *Environmental Effects of Army Actions*. Upon final review and concurrence with this environmental assessment's findings that the proposed Federal action would not be expected to result in significant environmental effects, Fort Meade would issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI). The public and concerned organizations would be informed of the FNSI and the availability of the EA by the publishing of a Notice of Availability (NOA) in local newspapers. For a period of thirty (30) days, starting with the day that the NOA is advertised, concerned organizations and the public would be encouraged to submit comments on the proposed action, the EA, and the FNSI. Work on the proposed action will not commence until this timeframe is observed and any resulting issues resolved. At any point in the process, the public may obtain information on the status and progress of the proposed action and the EA by contacting the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Planning Division point of contact Mr. David Hand, telephone (410) 962-8154.

1.5 Framework for Analysis

A decision on whether to proceed with the proposed action rests on numerous factors, such as: (1) the Army's changing mission requirements, (2) the receipt, evaluation, and acceptance of qualified proposals by prospective non-Federal offerors and ultimately the award of a contract(s) to a successful offeror(s), (3) availability of Army funding, (4) determination of economic

viability, and (5) environmental considerations. In addressing environmental considerations, MDW and Fort Meade are guided by several relevant statutes and regulations, and by Executive Orders that establish standards and provide guidance on environmental and natural resource management and planning. These include the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, Farmland Protection Policy Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), Executive Order 12088 (Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards), Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations), and Executive Order 13045 (Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks). Where useful to better understanding, key provisions of these statutes and Executive Orders are described in more detail in the text of the EA. Table 1-1, provided below, summarizes the installation's current compliance status with these environmental statutes and Executive Orders.

Table 1-1. Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a]	
Acts	**Compliance[b]**
Anadromous Fish Conservation Act	FULL
Clean Air Act, as amended (Public Law 88-206)	FULL
Clean Water Act, as amended (Public Law 95-217)	FULL
Coastal Barrier Resources Act	FULL
Coastal Zone Management Act	FULL
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986	FULL
Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Public Law 93-205)	FULL
Estuary Protection Act	FULL
Federal Water Project Recreation Act	FULL
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 United States Code [U.S.C.] 661, et seq.)	FULL
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act	FULL
Marine Mammal Protection Act	FULL
Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended (Public Law 94-265)	FULL
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190)	Ongoing
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Public Law 89-665)	Ongoing
Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended	FULL
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Public Law 94-580)	FULL
Rivers and Harbors Act	FULL
Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (Public Law 93-523)	FULL
Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, as amended	FULL
Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-469)	FULL
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1101, et seq.)	FULL
Wetlands Conservation Act (Public Law 101-233)	Ongoing
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act	FULL

[a] Applies to all alternatives.

[b] Ongoing--Some requirements of the regulation remain to be met before implementing some activities. Full compliance is expected.

TABLE 1-1, continued
Compliance with Federal Environmental Statutes and Executive Orders[a]

Executive Orders	
Flood Plain Management (Executive Order 11988)	FULL
Protection of Wetlands (Executive Order 11990)	Ongoing
Federal Compliance with Pollution Standards (Executive Order 12088)	FULL
Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Executive Order 12898)	FULL
Invasive Species (Executive Order 13112)	FULL

[a]Applies to all alternatives.

[b]Ongoing--Some requirements of the regulation remain to be met before implementing some activities. Full compliance is expected.

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION

MDW and Fort Meade propose to implement DoD and DA directives and policy to privatize the electric and natural gas (Meade E&G UDC) systems at Fort Meade. The privatization of these systems would be carried out through two steps, a real estate transaction and a service contract. The real property assets associated with the UDC systems infrastructure would be transferred to a non-Federal entity through a bill of sale or deed and access to the land on which the real property is situated would be granted to the same non-Federal entity by a perpetual easement. Additionally, a 10 to up to 50-year utility service contract would be awarded in accordance with the current FAR. MDW and Fort Meade seek one qualified non-Federal entity, regulated or unregulated, to own, operate, and maintain the Meade E&G UDC systems. MDW and Fort Meade have arranged with the Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to be the contracting agent for implementing the proposed action.

Implementation of the proposed action would represent the Government's preferred alternative for privatization of its Meade E&G UDC systems. Other alternatives are presented in Section 3.0.

This EA was prepared to describe the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of privatizing the existing Meade E&G UDC systems. The relevant, current environmental conditions of the real property that would be transferred and the land associated with the known easement areas that would be conveyed are discussed herein. Upon contract award, it would become the responsibility of the non-Federal entity to initiate action to bring all UDC systems into compliance with the general and specific industry performance standards that would be identified in the contract. Importantly, the non-Federal entity would be permitted to propose replacement of all or parts of one or more existing UDC systems or the installation of new or extended utility services that could be run in alignments outside the easement limits issued at time of contract award. A very general discussion of the potential impacts of such proposals is included in this EA as part of the Cumulative Impacts in Section 5.10. It would be incumbent, however, on the non-Federal entity to perform or obtain, at their expense, any necessary studies, assessments and documentation and approvals required prior to performing work outside the areas covered in this EA. This would include executing activities to comply with NEPA, and other federal, state and local government laws, codes and regulations, including permits. Clauses, conditions and restrictions in the real estate documents and the utility service contract would be included to assure that the non-Federal entity is responsible.

3.0 ALTERNATIVES

The Government has identified three alternatives for its proposed action, as well as the no-action alternative. These alternatives are discussed below.

3.1 Out-Source Operation and Maintenance of Meade E&G UDC Systems

Under this alternative, the Government would out-source only the functions of operation and maintenance of the Meade E&G UDC systems. The Government would retain ownership of the UDC systems infrastructure.

Since no asset ownership would be transferred, no financial leverage or other investment incentive is included in this alternative. The out-source contractor could not and would not be required to provide the necessary, near-term and long- term, major capital improvements to the UDC systems infrastructure that is in poor condition or in need of total replacement. This alternative would maintain the process of annual budget requests from the installation to the MACOM, DA and Congress for needed physical improvements. This status quo situation has proven to be unsuccessful consistently in the past and detrimental to the viability of the utility systems. Congress, by enacting the legislation to authorize the Secretary of a Military Department to privatize all utility systems, has recognized this problem. Additionally, adoption of this alternative would not comply with the DoD and Army directives to divest Government ownership of UDC systems. It does not privatize the systems. For these reasons, this alternative is does not fully comply with the purpose and need criteria for the proposed action and, as a result, will not be addressed further.

3.2 Privatization Restricted to the Current Alignments of the Meade E&G UDC Systems

Under this alternative, the Government would implement privatization of its Meade E&G UDC systems described under the proposed action, but would restrict the non-Federal entity to effect repair, rehabilitation, replacement or other infrastructure improvements to the UDC systems as currently aligned and within the easements to be issued upon contract award.

The Government has determined that adoption of this alternative would unduly restrict potential offerors from proposing what they determined to be the most efficient and economic means to improve existing infrastructure. Offerors would be precluded from proposing relocated or new routes for UDC systems outside the limits of easements to be granted based on current UDC system alignments. MDW and Fort Meade believe that, given the opportunity, offerors would consider proposing new or relocated UDC systems alignments, especially for those systems considered in need of total or major replacement. One goal of the privatization process is to maximize infrastructure upgrades or other improvements as part of achieving efficient, safe reliable utility service to installation customers at the lowest cost. Most importantly, proposals to conduct work outside the existing utility routes would be considered under the proposed action, a newly proposed action that would required its own process to comply with NEPA and other environmental laws and regulations. Safeguards, in the form of contract clauses and easement

conditions and restrictions, requiring the privatization entity to be responsible for this compliance work would be placed in the appropriate proposed action documentation. For these reasons, this alternative is not reasonable at this time and not ripe for examination further in this EA.

3.3 Unrestricted Privatization of Meade E&G UDC Systems

Implementation of the proposed action, as described in Section 2.0, would represent the Government's preferred alternative for privatizing the electric and natural gas distribution systems under Government control at Fort Meade. Accordingly, the environmental and socioeconomic consequences of the preferred alternative are evaluated in detail in Section 4.0 of this document.

3.4 The No-Action Alternative

This document refers to the continuation of existing conditions of the affected environment, without implementation of the proposed action, as the no-action alternative. The Council on Environmental Quality requires inclusion of the no-action alternative. The no-action alternative serves as the baseline against which the proposed action and alternatives can be evaluated.

Under the no-action alternative, the Government would retain ownership of the Meade E&G UDC systems and would continue to be responsible for operating and maintaining those systems with its Directorate of Public Works (DPW) workforce. Maintenance and operational practices would most likely remain the same. Fort Meade would continue to obtain funding for the management of the utility systems through the congressional authorization and appropriations process. Any major changes to or construction of utility improvements would require that appropriate NEPA analyses are completed prior to implementing such actions.

Selecting the no-action alternative would not satisfy the need to provide immediate capital improvements to those existing systems or portions of systems in poor condition. Furthermore, it would not comply with DoD directives and Army policy to privatize UDC systems. Therefore, the no-action alternative is not preferred.

4.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

4.1 Project Area Description

4.1.1 Land Use

The installation contains administrative, maintenance, recreational areas and several housing areas. As a result of the transfer of the former range and training areas to the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), the mission of Fort Meade has changed from an administration and training facility to a tenant-based administration installation. Figure 3, Appendix B, depicts land use areas planned at Fort Meade (Versar, 1999). Fort Meade is a 13,413 acre mixed use military installation that engages primarily in administrative and intelligence functions for the U.S. Army, NSA and other related military units.

4.1.2 Geology

Fort Meade is in the Atlantic Coastal Plain Physiographic Province. It is underlain by wedge-shaped beds of unconsolidated sediments consisting primarily of sand, silt, and clay that thicken to the southeast. The unconsolidated sediments overlie crystalline rock of Precambrian to early Cambrian age. The crystalline basement underlying Fort Meade consists of gabbro, diorite, and other igneous and metamorphic rocks. The surface of these rocks dips to the southeast and acts as a lower confining layer for the Potomac Group. The premise that the crystalline basement rock acts as a confining layer is a result of the low conductivity of similar crystalline rocks in the Maryland Piedmont (Mach and Achmad, 1986).

4.1.3 Soils

The Fort George G. Meade Soil Survey (Natural Resources Conservation Service, 1995) identifies 39 distinct soil-mapping units on Fort Meade. Most of the soils are part of the Evesboro complex. Evesboro soils are very deep, excessively drained sandy loam soils on uplands.

Modified soil areas mapped within Fort Meade include loamy and clayey land, urban land, cut and fill areas, and gravel and borrow pit operations. Loamy and clayey land consists of mantles of various kinds of soils that overlie clay deposits, but which are unrelated to the underlying subsoil. Urban land comprises those areas in the vicinity of pavements and buildings on the installation. Cut and fill land consists of severely disturbed areas of miscellaneous soil types that have been altered by earth-moving equipment. Gravel and borrow pit areas define land where soil material has been removed for construction, landfill, or mining operations. Such areas have been altered so severely that their association with a soil series is impossible to determine (USDA 1995).

Development limitations on Fort Meade are defined primarily by slope and areas of wetness caused by seasonal high water. Soils having "severe" limitations to development are generally unfavorable for the construction of small commercial buildings. Soils having '"moderate" building limitations exhibit few constraints, whereas soils having "slight" building limitations

have little or no development constraints. In all cases, sites should be evaluated individually to determine the extent of development limitations specific to that location.

4.1.4 Topography and Drainage

Fort Meade has approximately 210 feet of topographic relief. The highest point, 310 feet mean sea level (MSL), occurs at the lst Army Radio Station Tower, located in the northernmost central portion of the installation. The lowest elevation, less than 100 feet MSL, occurs in the southwestern corner of Fort Meade, along the Little Patuxent River.

Most of the installation slopes gradually to the south and southwest. Slopes exceeding 10 percent are rare and occur primarily in pockets in the north-central and central portions of the installation and along stream corridors. The southern half of Fort Meade contains gradual slopes, generally less than 6 percent.

4.1.5 Climate

The annual mean temperature at Fort Meade is 61° Fahrenheit (F), with an average daily maximum of 72° F and minimum of 45° F. Annual temperature extremes range from -6° F to 100° F (U.S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency. 1989). Precipitation averages 41 inches annually, including 22 inches of snow. Rainfall occurs throughout the year, but the greatest amounts occur in the summer and fall during heavy thunderstorms. The installation has moderate to high humidity levels throughout the year. Prevailing winds are light to moderate and come from the west.

4.2 Air Quality

Fort Meade is situated within Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Air Quality Control Area III, the Baltimore Metropolitan Air Quality Control Area. This region comprises Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, and Howard Counties and Baltimore City.

The State of Maryland had adopted ambient air quality standards and guidelines for the following pollutants:

- Particulate matter-10 microns (PM-10)
- Carbon monoxide (CO)
- Sulfur dioxide (SO_2)
- Nitrogen dioxide (NO_2)
- Lead (Pb)
- Ozone (O_3)
- Fluorides
- Other pollutants (for example, arsenic, chromium, and acid deposition) also are monitored at selected locations.

The air quality data (USEPA, 1991 and 1996) reported from the ambient air monitoring stations closest to Fort Meade indicate that the air quality meets National and Maryland Ambient Air Quality Standards for all monitored pollutants except ozone. As part of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA's) Baltimore Area Air Quality Control Region, Anne

Arundel County is designated as a severe non-attainment area for ozone. Air quality data reported in the MDE's Maryland Air Quality Data Report, 1996, for the station located at Fort Meade indicate that the maximum 1-hour ozone standard was exceeded on 2 days in 1996. The 1995 data indicate that the ozone standard was exceeded on 4 days; in 1993, on 3 days.

4.3 Water Quality

Upstream from a point 1 mile south of the Route 198 bridge, the Little Patuxent River and its tributaries are designated Use I-P waters and are protected for water contact recreation, protection of aquatic life, and public water supply. Use I-P waters may be used for the following activities:

- Water contact sports
- Play and leisure-time activities where individuals may come into contact with the surface water
- Fishing
- The growth and propagation of fish (other than trout), other aquatic life, and wildlife
- Agricultural water supply
- Industrial water supply
- Public water supply

The portion of the installation with frontage on the Little Patuxent River, in the southwest corner of Fort Meade near the wastewater treatment facility, contains palustrine and riverine wetlands. This area also is part of the 100-year floodplain of the river. The Patuxent River, into which the Little Patuxent River flows, is a large contributor to the middle Chesapeake Bay. Because of its location, many of Fort Meade's environmental concerns are focused on the Chesapeake Bay and the impacts Fort Meade may have on the Bay and the Patuxent River watershed.

4.3.1 Surface Water

Fort Meade lies within the 160-square-mile Little Patuxent River Drainage Basin. In the vicinity of the post, the river averages 30 feet in width and 2 feet in depth. Most of the installation is drained by two tributaries of the Little Patuxent River: Midway Branch and Franklin Branch. Surface flow on the installation is primarily south-southwest.

Midway Branch drains the center of the post and flows southeasterly, then southerly to a confluence with Franklin Branch, where it is renamed Rogue Harbor Branch. Its watershed comprises approximately 1,860 acres, located almost entirely within the installation (Kamber Engineering, 1991). Rogue Harbor Branch empties into Soldiers Lake, a 19.7-acre man-made lake used for stormwater management, flood control, and limited recreational purposes. South of Soldiers Lake, the tributary drains directly into the Little Patuxent River.

Franklin Branch originates in the northeastern portion of Fort Meade, just south of MacArthur Road, and flows south into Burba Lake. Burba Lake is a 7.9-acre man-made recreational lake on the southeast side of the installation. The watershed of Franklin Branch covers approximately 1,130 acres and is contained primarily within Fort Meade (Kamber Engineering, 1991). South of Burba Lake, Franklin Branch flows a short distance southeast to its confluence with Midway Branch.

4.3.2 Groundwater

Three aquifers—the Patuxent Aquifer and the Lower Patapsco Aquifer and the Upper Patapsco Aquifer—underlie Fort Meade. The aquifers are separated by the Arundel Clay formation. The Patuxent Aquifer, which directly overlays the crystalline basement, consists of lenticular interfingering sands, silts, and clays capable of yielding large quantities of water. The aquifer is at or near the surface near the fall line (the boundary between the Coastal Plain and Piedmont physiographic provinces) and dips below the surface as it moves eastward. The aquifer is between 200 and 400 feet thick beneath Fort Meade.

The Lower Patapsco Aquifer is composed of fine- to medium-grained brown sand that overlays the Arundel Clay. It is capable of yielding 0.5 to 2 million gallons per day (mgd) of water from individual wells in most localities and is a source of water for several large wells within the region (Mach and Achmad, 1986).

The Upper Patapsco Aquifer consists of fine to medium sized brown sand. Its average width is 250 feet. The aquifer is under confined conditions and is one of the best water bearing formations in Anne Arundel County (Mach and Achmad, 1986).

Flow from both aquifers is toward the southeast in the confined portions and toward the Patuxent and Little Patuxent Rivers in the unconfined portions. Recharge to deep artesian wells is slow because of the low permeability of the confining layers.

Fort Meade withdraws potable water from the Patuxent Aquifer. In general, water from this aquifer is soft (hardness 6 to 8.4 milligrams per liter [mg/L] calcium carbonate), acidic (pH 4.9 to 5.0), high in iron (0.77 to 2.7 mg/L), low in chlorides (5 to 8.4 mg/L), and low in total dissolved solids (38 mg/L) (Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR), 1987). In general, the iron levels in groundwater from the Patuxent Aquifer exceed Federal drinking water standards and require treatment at Fort Meade.

4.4 Aquatic Resources and Wetlands

4.4.1 Aquatic Resources

Burba Lake, located within the Fort Meade cantonment area, is stocked with catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*), bluegill (*Lepomis macrochirus*), and large-mouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*). Pickerel (*Esox niger*) and black crappie (*Pomoxis nigromaculatus*) are also commonly caught there.

Fish species known to inhabit the Little Patuxent River adjacent to Fort Meade include fall fish (*Semotilus corporalis*), small-mouthed bass (*Micropterus dolomieui*), yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*), and striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*). Warmouth perch (*Lepomis gulosis*) have also been noted in small beaver ponds in the Little Patuxent River drainage on Fort Meade. A state-listed endangered fish, the glassy darter (*Etheostoma vitreum*), has been identified within the Patuxent River.

Waterfowl found at Fort Meade include Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*) and mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*); species which are common to urban pond and shallow water habitats.

4.4.2 Wetlands

Of the approximately 5,500 acres on Fort Meade, only 154 acres are designated as wetlands. The majority of those wetlands are situated in the floodplain of the Little Patuxent River, in the southwestern section of the installation. A jurisdictional wetland delineation was not performed for this project. As an indicator of the potential extent and nature of wetlands on the sites, nontidal wetland maps prepared by the MD DNR, Water Resources Administration, in 1989 were reviewed. In addition, the Fort Meade soil survey and wetland maps were examined to determine whether known hydric soils or wetlands are present on any of the sites. The presence of a mapped hydric soil series on a site is generally a good indicator of the presence, if not the extent, of wetland habitat. Because hydric soils are only one of the three parameters necessary to define a jurisdictional wetland, and because soil surveys generally lack the precision necessary for specific site determinations, a review of hydric soil mapping units on a site should only be considered as a good screening tool.

This review, in conjunction with the review of MD DNR maps, indicated that there are several wetland areas on the Fort Meade installation. These wetland areas are predominantly riverine or palustrine emergent freshwater wetlands. Typical species include rushes (*Juncus spp.*), sedges (*Carex spp.*), cattail (*Typha latifolia*), goosefoot (*Polygonum spp.*), and black willow (*Salix nigra*). Figure 4, Appendix B, depicts wetlands, floodplains and aquatic resource areas on Fort Meade.

4.5 Vegetation

Extensive development at Fort Meade has resulted in the retention of few areas of native vegetation on the post, most of which are associated with the streams that drain the post. The largest wooded area on the post is in the southwest corner and is associated with the Little Patuxent River. The dominant vegetation in this area is red maple (*Acer rubrum*), sweet gum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), black gum (*Nyssa sylvatica*), northern arrowwood (*Viburnum recognitum*), Japanese honeysuckle (*Lonicera japonica*), greenbriar (*Smilax rotundifolia*), and poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*).

Smaller wooded areas are scattered throughout the post, in the uplands. They are dominated by white (*Quercus alba*), red (*Quercus rubra*), and chestnut oak (*Quercus prinus*); mockernut and pignut hickory (*Carya tomentosa* and *Carya glabra*); flowering dogwood (*Cornus florida*); blueberry (*Vaccinium corymbosum*); greenbriar; loblolly and pitch pine (*Pinus taeda* and *Pinus rigida*); and poison ivy. Figure 5, Appendix B, depicts forest conservation areas, including existing forest stands, on the installation.

Most of the developed portions of Fort Meade have been landscaped using a combination of turf grasses interspersed with native and exotic trees and shrubs including elm (*Ulmus sp.*), maple (*Acer sp.*), flowering cherry (*Prunus sp.*), weeping willow (*Salix babylonica*), flowering dogwood (*Cornus florida*), and an assortment of holly cultivars (*Ilex sp*).

4.6 Wildlife Resources

The Fort Meade installation provides habitat typical of other urban or suburban environments, including mowed lawns and tree-lined streets. This type of habitat is most conducive to small mammals and birds, including eastern gray squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*), raccoon, eastern cottontail rabbit (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), mourning dove (*Zenaidura macroura*), starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), robin (*Turdus migratorius*), mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottus*), sparrows (*Spizella spp*.), wrens (*Troglodytes spp*.), chickadees (*Parus spp*.), and transient whitetail deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*).

4.7 Threatened and Endangered Species

According to the USFWS (Appendix A), there are no Federally listed rare, threatened, or endangered species on the installation. The Maryland Natural Heritage Program reports occurrences of a state-endangered fish, the glassy darter (*Etheostoma vitreum*), within the Patuxent River. Additionally, Fort Meade has identified several rare species on the Fort Meade cantonment area (EcoScience Professionals, 1994). The known locations of these species are shown in Appendix B, Figure 6: Habitat Protection Areas and Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species. This map also shows the location of the five Habitat Protection Areas that Fort Meade has also established to protect unique habitat areas such as magnolia swamps.

4.8 Prime and Unique Farmlands

Prime farmland is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops, and is also available for these uses (the land could be cropland, pastureland, forest land, or other land, but not urban built-up land or water). It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to economically produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed, including water management, according to acceptable farming methods.

In general, prime farmlands have an adequate and dependable water supply from precipitation or irrigation, a favorable temperature and growing season, acceptable acidity or alkalinity, acceptable salt content, and few or no rocks. They are permeable to water and air. Prime farmlands are not excessively erodible or saturated with water for a long period of time, and they either do not flood frequently or are protected from flooding.

The following list of soil survey map units meet the soil requirements for prime farmland in the survey area. Soils that have limitations, such as a high water table or flooding, may qualify as prime farmland if these limitations are overcome by such measures as drainage or flood control. In the following list, the measures needed to overcome the limitations of a map unit, if any, are shown in the appropriate column of Table 4-1, and described in the table footer.

Table 4-1. Prime and Unique Farmland Soils on Fort Meade

Name	Abbr.	Detail Code	Acres	Percent
Downer Loamy Sand 2 to 5 percent slopes	DoB	4	104	2.1
Downer Loamy Sand 5 to 10 percent slopes	DoC	4	68	1.4
Downer Sandy Loam 2 to 5 percent slopes	DwB	1	11	0.2
Downer Sandy Loam 5 to 10 percent slopes	DwC	1	8	0.2
Fallsington Sandy Loam	Fa	2	195	4.0
Hambrook Sandy Loam 2 to 5 percent slopes	HbB	1	70	1.4
Hambrook Sandy Loam 5 to 10 percent slopes	HbC	1	57	1.2
Ingleside Sandy Loam 0 to 2 percent slopes	InA	1	2	0.0
Keyport Sandy Loam 5 to 10 percent slopes	KeC	1	23	0.5
Keyport Silt Loam 0 to 2 percent slopes	KpA	1	46	0.9
Keyport Silt Loam 2 to 5 percent slopes	KpB	1	134	2.7
Sassafras Sandy Loam 2 to 5 percent slopes	SaB	1	11	0.2
Woodstown Loam 0 to 2 percent slopes	WdA	1	86	1.8
Woodstown Loam 2 to 5 percent slopes	WdB	1	35	0.7
TOTAL:			850	17.3

Source: Natural Resources Conservation Service, 1995

Detail Code	Description
1	All areas are prime farmland
2	Only drained areas are prime farmland
3	Only irrigated areas are prime farmland
4	Unique Farmlands

4.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Maryland rivers fall under the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers designation. However, the Patuxent River was designated as a state of Maryland scenic river by the 1969 Scenic and Wild Rivers Act; the MD DNR is charged with protecting the water quality of all rivers designated as a Scenic and Wild River of the state of Maryland (Final Environmental Impact Statement, Comprehensive Base Realignment and Partial Closure for Fort Meade and Fort Holabird, 1991).

4.10 Cultural Resources

4.10.1 Previous Investigations

Numerous archeological and architectural investigations have been conducted at Fort Meade. These surveys have identified numerous historic properties that are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Currently there are no properties on Fort Meade that are formally listed in the National Register. Fort Meade was the subject of several archeological studies in the 1970s and 1980s, and early 1990s.

In 1994 a Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) (Goodwin et al., 1994) was prepared for Fort Meade. The CRMP summarized previous investigations, evaluated pre-1945 buildings for National Register eligibility, and made recommendations for future work.

Small Phase I archeological surveys have also been completed at Fort Meade. Between 1995 and 1998 a complete Phase I archeological survey was conducted at Fort Meade (Hornum et al., 1994; Hunter Research, 1998). In addition to the archeological investigations, extensive architectural surveys have been completed at Fort Meade. Many of the pre-1945 buildings were evaluated for National Register eligibility during the preparation of the CRMP. Several World War I and World War II buildings were recommended for additional investigation. These buildings were subsequently evaluated in follow-up surveys.

4.10.2 Archeological Resources

The Phase I archeological surveys identified a total of 29 archeological sites on Fort Meade. Of these 29 sites, 14 were found not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Fifteen sites were recommended for additional testing prior to any soil disturbance in those areas. The sites are a mix of prehistoric and historic sites. Included among these sites are 11 prehistoric sites, 11 historic period sites, 4 cemeteries that predate Fort Meade, 1 military period site, and 2 sites that contain both prehistoric and historic components.

Due to the sensitive nature of the site location information, no information about the specific location of the sites is provided in this document. Site information may be provided to appropriate individuals or agencies on a need-to-know basis, after consultation with the Meade Department of Public Works (DPW), Environmental Management Office (EMO).

4.10.3 Architectural Resources

Architectural investigations have identified two historic properties at Fort Meade that are eligible for listing in the NRHP.

The Fort Meade Historic District is eligible for listing in the NRHP. Figure 7, Appendix B, delineates the Proposed Historical District. There are 132 contributing buildings in the historic district. Buildings in the District are primarily family housing units, but there is also a mix of administrative buildings, a firehouse, a theater, and a chapel. The District is centrally located in the middle of the installation. Table 4-2 lists the buildings that are included in the Fort Meade Historic District.

Table 4-2: Fort Meade Historic District List of Buildings

Buildings Listed in the
NRHP Eligible Historic District
by Building Number

37	2591	4237	4256	4325	4413	4535
38	2592	4238	4257	4326	4415	4536
40	2593	4239	4258	4327	4419	4537
41	2594	4240	4259	4331	4431	4538
43	2595	4241	4260	4332	4501	4539
44	2596	4242	4302	4333	4511	4541
2561	2597	4243	4303	4334	4519	4542
2579	2598	4244	4304	4335	4521	4543
2580	2599	4245	4305	4336	4522	4544
2581	4215	4246	4306	4337	4523	4546
2582	4216	4247	4307	4341	4524	4547
2583	4217	4248	4311	4342	4526	4548
2584	4230	4249	4312	4351	4527	4549
2585	4231	4250	4316	4352	4528	4551
2586	4232	4251	4317	4353	4529	4552
2587	4233	4252	4321	4354	4531	4553
2588	4234	4253	4322	4355	4532	4554
2589	4235	4254	4323	4356	4533	4585
2590	4236	4255	4324	4411	4534	8688

There are no buildings that predate the establishment of Camp Meade/Fort Meade remaining on the installation. The remaining 23 World War I period buildings on Fort Meade were evaluated for NRHP eligibility and all of them were determined to be ineligible for listing. Several World

War II permanent and semi-permanent buildings were recommended for additional evaluation in the CRMP. These buildings were evaluated and one (Building 8688, the water treatment plant) was determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. The majority of the World War II buildings that were constructed at Fort Meade were temporary mobilization buildings. Historic American Building Survey documentation has been completed on 700 and 800 series World War II temporary buildings as part of a 1986 Programmatic Agreement (PA) on World War II temporary construction.

4.11 Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Substances (HTRS)

The Fort Meade DPW, Environmental Management Office (EMO), coordinates inventories of hazardous materials (HAZMATs) and disposal of hazardous waste. Emergency response to spills of hazardous waste and materials is conducted through on-site coordinators, installation fire department, and an installation HAZMAT team.

4.11.1 Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) and Above-Ground Storage Tanks (ASTs)

Technical requirements for existing underground storage tanks (UST's) were issued by EPA in 1988. The regulations were adopted in response to Subtitle I of RCRA. Within RCRA, a Federal program regulating USTs was established. AR 200-1, Environmental Protection and Enhancement, adopted stricter regulations for USTs than the Federal requirements. The State of Maryland also has adopted UST regulations that expand upon Federal regulations by including USTs containing heating oil. A state inspector is assigned to Fort Meade. Fort Meade maintains a database that catalogues the status, age, content, and condition of all UST's on the installation. Currently, there are thirteen (13) active UST’s on Fort Meade, and thirty two (32) abandoned USTs, six (6) of which are scheduled for removal.

All of the active tanks contain either fuel oil, waste oil, gasoline, or diesel fuel. There are fifty four (54) above ground tanks most of which are fitted with high-level alarms to prevent overfilling. Older tanks, not furnished with additional preventative and protective equipment, are precision-tested periodically for leaks. The type and degree of preventive and protective equipment on the tanks varies with the age and contents of the tank.

4.11.2 Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

EPA regulation 40 CFR 761.30 requires that all 480-volt PCB transformers to have either advanced primary protection, be removed, or be reclassified to non-PCB status through a retrofit process. The decision between replacement or retrofitting is clarified by Engineering Technical Letter (ETL) 1110-3-412 Transformer Application Guidance, which required the replacement of transformers with PCB concentrations of more than 1,000 parts per million (ppm).

Transformers are classified into three categories, on the basis of the level of PCB contamination within the unit. The categories are PCB (more than 500 ppm), PCB contaminated (50 to 499 ppm), and non-PCB (less than 50 ppm). Fort Meade has removed all transformers with PCB levels of 50 or more ppm.

4.11.3 Radon

In response to concern over indoor air concentrations of radon, the Army formulated the Army Radon Reduction Program (ARRP). The objectives of the ARRP are to do the following:

- Identify structures owned and leased by the Army that have indoor radon levels greater than 4 picocuries per liter (pCi/L) of air.

- Modify all Army-owned structures having radon levels greater than 4 pCi/L so that levels are reduced to 4 pCi/L or less.

- Provide detailed guidance concerning radon measurement procedures and risk estimates that have been published in the U.S. Army Environmental Health Agency Technical Guide No. 164.

- Issue mitigation strategies and procedures that will be addressed in separate publications furnished by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The Army has adopted EPA's recommended remedial action level as its indoor radon standard. Levels of radon exceeding 4 pCi/L of air require mitigation efforts. Radon monitoring was conducted in 1990 to detect any potential areas with levels of radon exceeding 4 pCi/L. Radon monitoring at Fort Meade is complete, and results from the survey have found radon concentrations to be within the EPA acceptable levels, requiring no action.

4.11.4 Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM)

The National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), 40 CFR 61, Subpart M, regulates the release of asbestos fibers into the air. Originally directed at the asbestos industry, the standard has been amended to include building demolitions and renovations. Before renovation or demolition, a facility must be inspected for the presence of asbestos-containing material (ACM). If ACM is present, a series of control and notification procedures must be conducted. In addition, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulates a worker's exposure to asbestos (29 CFR 1926.58). The Army complies with all applicable Federal, state, and local requirements for asbestos management.

Installation-wide asbestos surveys for most of Fort Meade is have been completed. A survey conducted in 1990 in the family housing areas of the installation found some buildings contained ACM's. Commonly identified suspect sources included boiler, pipe, and roof insulation; ceiling and floor tiles; fire doors; and roof tars and sealants. Before demolition or renovation of structures on the installation, however, an EPA-certified asbestos inspector inspects the affected areas and identifies all friable asbestos that potentially could be released during the proposed action. Trained teams of individuals at Fort Meade are deployed after the identification process to remove the asbestos. The material is then bagged and disposed of at an approved, off-site landfill. The Fort Meade Asbestos Management Program (1998) contains asbestos management

procedures employed by the DPW Environmental Management Office (EMO) (CH2M Hill, 1999).

4.11.5 Lead-Based Paint (LBP)

Installation-wide lead-based paint (LBP) surveys have been conducted at Fort Meade. In some cases, potential LBPs areas have been covered by numerous changes in painting schemes over the years, especially in the barracks. It is reasonable to assume that other structures on the installation, particularly those constructed before the 1970's, when lead based paint products were used, may also contain LBP.

4.11.6 Pesticides, Herbicides, and Fertilizers

Those pesticides generally used on Ft. Meade include insecticides, herbicides, rodenticides, fungicides, and occasionally nematicides. Handling concentrated pesticides during storage and preparation and during application are carried out by certified pest applicators. All pesticides are stored in Bldg. 294 and the golf course pesticide storage building. Pesticides are stored in their original containers in the designated pesticide storage areas (Draft Fort Meade Pest Management Plan, 1998).

4.11.7 Storage of Hazardous Materials

All sites that maintain stocks of HAZMATs are instructed by the DPW to submit their inventories to the DPW EMO. Hazardous material safety data sheet (MSDS's) and appropriate Installation Spill Contingency Plan (ISCP) emergency response instructions are posted at each site. At this time, Fort Meade is in the process of establishing a Hazardous materials management program (HAZMAT). The HAZMAT program will be responsible for purchasing and tracking such materials within the Fort Meade installation boundaries.

Guidance for activities associated with the handling, storage, transportation, and disposal of HAZMATs are outlined in the 1998 Department of the Army, Draft Management Plan for Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, Fort George G. Meade. The plan also outlines command responsibilities, identification procedures, inspections, personnel training, and spill response and emergency procedures.

Personnel employed at Fort Meade who manage or handle HAZMATs, or who respond to HAZMAT incidents, are trained in accordance with Federal, state, local, and Army requirements. Training is the responsibility of each activity's director. Fort Meade has a trained HAZMAT team.

4.11.8 Contaminated Areas

A draft Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) (CH2M Hill, 1999) has been prepared for the Residential Communities Initiative (RCI) at Fort Meade. The scope of this EBS covers a substantial portion of the installation, as there are multiple family housing areas to be considered throughout Fort Meade. An EBS is conducted to determine the presence or potential presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or the potential for future release into structures or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property. This RCI EBS provides information to

preliminarily identify the potential environmental contamination liabilities associated with acquisition, transfer, or disposal of UDC system infrastructure .

Upon completion of a records review and a visual site inspection, the sites are categorized as a Type I, II, or III property. Site categorization is based on the following criteria:

- A Type I property has little potential for environmental contamination or disruption from past, present, or proposed activities. The property is typically located in a non-hazardous location, such as administrative or residential areas.

- Type II property has some potential for environmental contamination or disruption from past, present, or proposed activities. Current and former industrial sites are typically categorized as Type II properties.

- A Type III property has known environmental contamination or disruption from past or present activities. Sites currently known to be contaminated are included in this category. Examples include unexploded ordnance at a former range, or known disposal sites for hazardous substances as identified in previous studies.

These criteria are identified in AR 200-1.

4.12 Infrastructure

Unless otherwise noted, information under this subsection 4.12 was obtained from the MDW Final Consolidated Utility Privatization Request for Proposal (RFP) 1999.

4.12.1 Electrical Distribution System Description and Requirements

4.12.1.1 Current Service Arrangements.

Fort Meade currently purchases electricity from Baltimore Gas and Electric (BGE) Company, under Schedule P – Primary Voltage Service, through two (2) main BGE 110-kV feeder lines. Fort Meade's distribution system (excluding the National Security Agency (NSA)) is connected to BGE's 110-kV lines through one (1) substation which is located within the Installation's perimeter between Rock Avenue and Maryland Route 32. This substation is referred to as Substation #3. Substation #3 has two (2) 20,000 kVA transformers that step the voltage down to 13.8 kV. Buildings in Fort Meade's Building #9800 Area (excluding NSA) and Family Housing areas on the Northwest section of the Installation are fed from Substation #2 owned by NSA. Fort Meade customers use approximately 20% of the power supplied by Substation #2. The Fort Meade electric distribution system contains approximately 261,000 feet (49.5 miles) of overhead and underground conductor. BGE meters the electric power on the high voltage side of the substation. The proposed action would not include the procurement of electricity and would not, therefore, affect the current electricity contract with BGE.

4.12.1.2 Electrical Distribution System.

Fort Meade substations #1 and #4 provide electric service exclusively to the NSA Complex and are therefore excluded from the Contract. Substation #2 provides electric service to both the

NSA Complex and portions of Fort Meade. Substations #3 provides electric service to the remaining portions of Fort Meade. A number of areas of the electric distribution system may require replacements, improvements or upgrades to conform with commonly accepted industry standards and practices such as the National Electric Safety Code (NESC).

4.12.1.3 Electrical System Requirements.

Implementation of the proposed action would make the non-Federal entity responsible to manage the operation, maintenance, repairs, replacement, extension and/or removal of all or portions of the electrical distribution system to ensure adequate and dependable electric service is distributed to each Government or tenant connection within the installation premises. The non-Federal entity would assume ownership at the point of attachment on the high side of each of the two step down 110 kV/13.8 kV transformers in the Fort Meade Substation #3. Provisions shall be made to have the non-Federal entity assume ownership of the Fort Meade portion of the electrical distribution system fed by the NSA-owned Substation #2.

4.12.1.4 Transmission Voltage / Demarcation Requirements.

Transmission voltage shall be distributed throughout the Installation for transformation to a primary voltage of 13.8 kV. The non-Federal entity would be responsible for ensuring proper distribution of primary voltage for final transformation to typical operating voltages of 120, 208, 240 V single- and three-phase at 60 Hz for each building or facility served. The Government would retain the responsibility at the service entrance (weatherhead, typically) for all aerial services up to the main breaker (disconnect or panel), within a building on the secondary side. Excluded service locations are; all NSA facilities, Building #701, EPA, New Meade Heights Elementary School, and Meade Middle School.

4.12.2 Natural Gas Utility Distribution System Description and Requirements

4.12.2.1 Current Service Arrangements.

Fort Meade purchases firm natural gas service from BGE under the Company's Schedule C – General Service. Six delivery points are used to deliver natural gas to the Fort Meade installation. Nine delivery points are located on the Fort Meade utility maps, three of which serve NSA and are therefore excluded from this proposed action. All natural gas distribution utility facilities that serve the NSA Complex will be excluded in this proposed action. The natural gas commodity is currently supplied through a DoD supply contract and transported to the Fort Meade distribution system by BGE. The proposed action would not include the procurement of natural gas and would not, therefore, affect the current natural gas contract with BGE .

4.12.2.2 Natural Gas Distribution System.

Fort Meade natural gas distribution system consists primarily of approximately 218,040 feet (41.3 miles) of underground coated steel pipe and rigid poly-vinyl chloride (PVC) pipe. The coated steel pipe range in size from one inch to eight inches. The natural gas distribution system consists of approximately 129 main valves of various sizes, 34 main meters and approximately 1271 building services throughout Fort Meade. BGE supplies the natural gas at an average pressure of 100 psi at the nine delivery points and is reduced by the natural gas distribution system to an average operating pressure of 10-17 psi.

4.12.2.3 Natural Gas System Requirements.

Implementation of the proposed action would make the non-Federal entity responsible to manage the maintenance, repairs expansion, and replacement of the natural gas distribution system to ensure that adequate and dependable natural gas service is distributed to each Government or tenant connection within the service premises. The non-Federal entity would also be responsible for funding all capital investments required to acquire (if applicable), maintain, and operate the Fort Meade natural gas distribution system in a safe, reliable manner and to meet the requirements listed herein including environmental compliance. The non-Federal would also be responsible for the abandonment and environmental compliance necessary to de-commission the existing natural gas distribution system, if such action were determined to be necessary.

4.12.2.4 Demarcation Requirements

If the proposed action were to be implemented, the Government would maintain responsibility from the down stream side of the building service entrance, regulator, or meter for the natural gas system. The non-Federal entity would assume responsibility from the up stream side of the building service entrance to the low side of the BGE/Fort Meade natural gas delivery points. Excluded services locations are; all NSA facilities, Building #6500, Defense Information School (DINFOS), Building #701, EPA, Building #1900, Old Meade Heights Elementary School, New Meade Heights Elementary School, Meade Middle School, MacArthur Junior High School, Building #1250, United States Army Reserve (USAR) Center, and under construction Building #8481, #8483, #8484, #8485, #8487, #8488, #8492, and #8692.

4.12.3 Solid Waste

Fort Meade generates approximately 100 tons per day of household, commercial, and industrial solid waste. Of this amount, approximately 19 percent, or about 19 tons of cardboard, white and colored paper, paper pulp, phonebooks, scrap metal and aluminum cans is recycled. All residential occupants of Fort Meade participate in the recycling program. The remaining 81 tons of solid waste are collected and disposed of at the Millersville sanitary landfill.

4.12.4 Traffic and Transportation

4.12.4.1 Ground Transportation

Major primary access roadways to the Fort Meade area in Anne Arundel County include: Baltimore-Washington Parkway (Route 295) which provides north-south access between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. No trucks are permitted on the parkway south of State Route 175. State Route 175 provides access from I-95 and Route 295 and from State Route 3. I-95 provides north-south access to the post for all vehicular traffic. State Route 32 (Patuxent Freeway) provides access to Fort Meade and Odenton from the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and State Route 97.

Other roadways to Fort Meade include: State Route 3 which provides north-south access between Southgate and Bowie, Maryland; State Route 198 which provides east-west access between Laurel, Maryland, and Fort Meade; and State Route 713 (Rockenbach Road) which provides primary access to Fort Meade from the north.

Two commuter railroad lines serve the Fort Meade area, providing access between Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, D.C. Currently, Maryland Transportation Authority (MTA) offers bus service to Fort Meade via bus #240.

4.12.4.2 Air Transportation

Three major commercial airports, one military airfield, and four small airfields are in the vicinity of Fort Meade. The commercial airports are in Anne Arundel County (Baltimore-Washington International Airport); Alexandria, Virginia (Reagan Washington National Airport), and Loudoun County, Virginia (Washington Dulles International Airport). Andrews Air Force Base in Prince George's County, Maryland, provides air cargo and military transportation. Three of the small airfields are located in southern Anne Arundel County and one is located in western Prince George's County.

4.13 Socioeconomic Conditions

4.13.1 Demographics

Anne Arundel County includes the City of Annapolis, which is the county seat and State capitol. The population in the county has grown over the past decade at a rate exceeding that of the Baltimore metropolitan area, and State. The 1998 estimated Anne Arundel County population was 476,060, an increase of 11.4% from the county's 1990 population of 427,239. Anne Arundel County's population is projected to grow to 502,100 by the year 2010 based on U.S. Census estimates. Fort Meade comprises all of census tract 406 in Anne Arundel County. Anne Arundel County Planning Department has estimated projects the number of persons to be 11,900 in 2000, and remain constant in the future.

The workforce population of Fort Meade in 1990 was approximately 33,900 employees (7,900 military and 26,000 civilian). The military workforce is comprised of approximately 3,100 Army officers and enlisted personnel; 4,800 Naval, Air Force, and Marine officers and enlisted personnel; and 26,000 civilians In 1998, the Directorate of Resources Management (DRM) estimated that 6,794 assigned military personnel live on the installation along with 6,034 dependents. The average daily installation population during weekday work hours is estimated to be 46,000 in 1998 including all assigned military, on post family members, civilian workers and volunteers.

4.13.2 Economics

The civilian workforce within Fort Meade represents a major component of local economy, since 26,000 civilians work at the installation, along with 7,900 active duty military service members and their families who are stationed, and live in the area. In 1999, there were 78 tenant organizations comprised of various service components located within Fort Meade. In addition, Fort Meade is envisioned as having a growing mission as a Federal Administrative center. The impact of Fort Meade government or related employment on the surrounding communities is significant, as it contributes approximately $2 billion dollars annually to the local economy. Fort

Meade's estimated annual nonsalary expenditure (not including technical procurement) for a utility, services, supplies and operational expenses in the area has been recently estimated to be $524,000,000 dollars per year in 1998. The 34,000 civilian and military employees within Fort Meade earn an estimated annual payroll of $1,478,000,000 dollars in 1999.

Private employers account for the largest number of new and existing jobs in Anne Arundel County, based upon recent statistics. Private employers provided 189,400 of the 262,100 jobs (72.3 percent) available in the county in 1995. Present employment in Anne Arundel County in 1998 was estimated to be 241,441 persons. In 1999, the unemployment rate for Anne Arundel County was 3.1%, lower than the Maryland average of 4.0% for the State of Maryland, and 4.2% U.S. rate. The average unemployment rate statewide is 5.1 percent, which is similar to the national average. The median household income in Anne Arundel County was $53,037 in 1995. Real property taxes collected in FY 1998 by Anne Arundel County amounted to $11.1 billion, of which $9.1 billion was obtained from residential property taxes.

4.13.3 Schools, Libraries, and Recreation Facilities

There are a number of schools that constitute the Meade feeder system for children of military personnel housed on post. The Meade feeder system includes nine elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. All of these schools belong to the Anne Arundel County Public School system. Four elementary schools, two middle schools and one high school are located on Fort Meade property, these schools are owned and operated by the Anne Arundel County School System. Pershing Hill, Manor View, Meade Heights, West Mead elementary schools are located on the installation and had a 1998-1999 student population of 1,672. MacArthur and Meade Middle Schools are located on the installation and had 1,625 students in 1998-1999. Meade Senior High School is also located on Fort Meade property and had a 1998 population of 1,877 students. The remaining feeder schools are located off post in the surrounding community. There are also a number of private schools surrounding the installation as well. Child care services are available through the Child Development Services which provides full day care and hourly care for infants to twelve years old.

Anne Arundel County School System is the fifth largest school system in the State of Maryland, and among the top fifty school systems in the U.S. The public school system employs 4,100 teachers and comprises a student population of 74,000 students. There are 115 schools in the county, 76 elementary schools, 18 middle schools, and 12 high schools. There are also two centers for applied technology, a Phoenix school for emotionally impaired students, and a middle school and high school for disruptive students. (Source: Anne Arundel County Public School, 2000)

Anne Arundel County offers a variety of private and public recreational facilities. There are approximately 7,518 acres devoted to parks and recreational facilities in the county including state and county parks, community and school recreation areas, and private facilities. The Anne Arundel County Department of Recreation and Parks manages or owns 92 parks and natural

areas that encompass 4,198 acres. These facilities include athletic fields, equestrian facilities, historic sites, picnic areas, bike paths, beach access areas, hiking trails, and natural areas.

Fort Meade has a number of recreational facilities. Burba Lake recreational area is located between Roberts and Llewellyn Avenue and Wilson street has five picnic areas, a cottage and playground. The Gaffney Sports Arena on base opened in 1997 and has: 3 basketball courts, 2 squash courts, 3 racquetball courts, sauna room, weight room, and a swimming pool. Other recreational areas within Fort Meade include, the McGill Recreation Center, Murphy Field House, outdoor swimming pools, an equestrian center, and stadium track Fort Meade has a golf complex consisting of two 18-hole golf courses.

4.13.4 Public Health and Safety

There are currently 56 full time military police officers who provide police protection at Fort Meade. Police stations are located in buildings 6618, 8609, 8477 and 8542. County and State police provide police service to the areas surrounding the installation. The nearest Anne Arundel County police station is located on the east side of the installation on Annapolis Road, near the Odenton Shopping Center. Approximately eighty eight Anne Arundel County officers are assigned to this station, and service the a number of areas including the Servern-Odenton area.

Two fire stations are located on Fort Meade and have a combined staff of 42 people. The main station located at 4320 Rock Avenue, houses two engine companies for a total of 27 fire fighters, 2 chiefs, and 3 inspectors. The equipment at the main station consists of 2 engine trucks, 3 fire inspection vehicles, 1 fire chief vehicle, 1 assistant chief vehicle, and 1 special utilities vehicle. The other fire station is located at the Tipton Army Airfield and houses 1 truck company which equals 10 fire fighters. This station also houses a 100-foot ladder truck, 1 crash truck, 1 fire engine, 1 small decontamination trailer, 1 small rescue vehicle and a hazardous materials trailer with 4X4 utility vehicle. The hazardous materials trailer and utility vehicle are schedules to be replaced with a Squad, composed of an engine truck / hazardous materials combination. (Versar, 2000).

Several hospitals and numerous medical centers are near Fort Meade. If an emergency occurs on the installation,, patients are transported to the installation's Kimbrough Ambulatory Care Center. Kimbrough is an emergency medical clinic that provides outpatient services only. Other emergency facilities are located off the installation at North Arundel Hospital in Glen Burnie; Greater Laurel Hospital in Prince George's County; and Anne Arundel Medical Center in Annapolis.

4.13.5 Noise

The main source of noise at Fort Meade and the surrounding areas is vehicular traffic on the surrounding roads and air traffic to and from the Baltimore-Washington-International Airport. Typical equivalent sound levels (L_{eq}) associated with traffic range between 50 and 55 decibels.

Other sources of noise on the post include normal operation of the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems; lawn maintenance; snow removal; and general maintenance of the streets and sidewalks. These activities produce minor noise levels. None of these operations or

activities produces excessive levels of noise, nor have they generated any complaints about noise.

4.13.6 Visual and Aesthetic Values

The visual images at Fort Meade range from views of streets lined with mature trees and open spaces to views of deteriorating WWII barracks. Because of the site topography and site development, there are no large vistas or viewsheds. Although the variety of architectural styles adds interest to the post, the appearance, especially in infill areas, is one of incomplete transition. Fort Meade is in the process, however, of removing many of the wooden structures built during WWII. New buildings constructed on these old sites would be designed in accordance with the Installation Design Guide, and, where required by proximity to the historic district, in consultation with the Maryland State Historic Preservation Officer, allowing for a more gradual blend of the various architectural styles and land uses.

4.14 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 requires Federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.

For this reason, Table 4-2 presents demographic information on race, ethnicity, and poverty status in the areas surrounding Fort Meade and in Anne Arundel County, as a baseline on which any such effects can be identified and analyzed.

Race refers to census respondents' self-identification of racial background. Hispanic origin refers to ethnicity and language, not race, and may include persons whose heritage is Puerto Rican, Cuban, Mexican, or Central or South American. As defined by the "Draft Guidance For Addressing Environmental Justice Under NEPA" (CEQ, 1996), "minority" includes persons who identify themselves as Asian or Pacific Islander, Native American or Alaskan Native, black (not of Hispanic origin), or Hispanic. A minority population exists where the percentage of minorities in an affected area either exceeds 50 percent or is meaningfully greater than in the general population. Low-income populations are identified using the Census Bureau's statistical poverty threshold, which is based on income and family size. The Census Bureau defines a "poverty area" as a census tract with 20 percent or more of its residents below the poverty threshold and an "extreme poverty area" as one with 40 percent or more below the poverty level.

Of the nine census block groups (subsets of a census tract) surrounding Fort Meade, two meet the 50 percent criterion for minority population and five others, including the census block group that includes Fort Meade, have meaningfully higher percentages of minorities when compared to Anne Arundel County as a whole, at least double the county's overall percentage (Table 4-3). Two of the census block groups meet the 20 percent definition of a poverty area; one of these also is considered a minority population but the other one is not. The other block groups with minority populations have a poverty rate similar to, or lower than, the county's. The poverty rate for the census block group that includes Fort Meade is the same as for Anne Arundel County as a whole.

One census block group (741100-1) meets the criterion for an "extreme poverty area," with 84 percent of its residents below the poverty threshold. However, this is probably because the District of Columbia's Children's Center comprises most of that particular block group.

Table 4-3: Minority and Low-Income Statistics for Fort Meade Area

Location [a]	Total Population	White	Black	American Indian [b]	Asian [c]	Other Race	Hispanic Origin [d]	Median Household Income	Poverty Rate [e]
Anne Arundel County	427,239	85.6%	11.8%	0.4%	1.8%	0.4%	1.6%	$45,147	4%
Fort Meade (740600-9) [f]	12,509	68.0%	25.4%	0.4%	3.4%	2.8%	6.6%	$28,444	4%
Census block groups adjoining Fort Meade (approximately 5-mile radius from center of post):									
740301-3 (southeast)	57	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	$60,000	0%
740301-4 (east)	328	82%	8%	0%	0%	10%	10%	$25,481	24%
740101-5 (east)	1,942	53%	38%	1%	8%	0%	1%	$41,250	4%
740101-6 (east)	3,676	22%	68%	0%	10%	0%	1%	$20,950	27%
740101-3 (northeast)	3,854	61%	32%	2%	4%	1%	6%	$37,266	9%
740101-4 (north)	1,732	69%	20%	1%	10%	1%	2%	$57,530	0%
740102-4 (north)	1,647	86.7%	8.0%	0.5%	4.4%	0.4%	2.8%	$48,565	2%
740102-3 (northwest)	449	53%	45%	0%	0%	3%	3%	$22,431	4%
741100-1 (southwest)[g]	656	16%	84%	0%	0%	0%	4%	$51,250	82%

Source: 1990 Census

Notes

[a] Key to Census block group numbers: 74030-1 [Census tract number] -3 [block group number]. Block groups are subsets within census tracts.

[b] Includes Alaskan Native (Inuit or Aleutian Islanders).

[c] Includes Pacific Islanders.

[d] Persons of Hispanic origin can be of any race and are counted in those categories also.

[e] Percent with 1989 incomes below poverty level.

[f] Census Block Group 740600-9 equals all of Fort Meade plus the acreage excessed from Fort Meade in 1991 and acquired by Patuxent Wildlife Center.

[g] Census Block Group 741100-1 is largely comprised of the District of Columbia Children's Center.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The subsections below describe the environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with implementation of the proposed action. The evaluation of effects is based upon the assumption that the non-Federal entity would be responsible for ensuring that all actions or practices involving future construction, maintenance, and upgrades of the utilities would comply with applicable Federal and State and local environmental laws and regulations. The no-action alternative would have no impacts to the resources presented in the subsections below.

The proposed action is envisioned as a two part initiative: part one is the actual contractual transfer of responsibilities from the Federal Government to the non-Federal entity and part two is the ongoing responsibility of the non-Federal entity to operate and maintain the Meade UDC systems, and expand these systems as future operational needs may require. Operation and maintenance will not modify the existing capacity of the systems. Therefore, these activities essentially result in no net change to the current natural and man-made environment. Expansion, however, implies an inherent change in supplied service that is a result of an increase in demand most likely to be expected from future building construction. Expansion of the services currently provided to the installation will result in some impact to the natural and man-made environment. The magnitude of these effects can be estimated by data such as the installation's 5-year Master Plan, which will be made available to all prospective offerors.

Expansion of the existing UDC systems, if and when it occurs, would be considered a Federal action, and would first require all environmental, cultural and other coordination with the installation and MDW to be performed before initiation of any physical work. The following paragraphs address impacts associated with expected UDC system expansion in a general sense, and do not attempt to identify specific instances.
The following list of resources was evaluated and it was determined that the proposed action would have no impact or appreciable detrimental effect on them:

- Land Use
- Climate
- Aquatic Resources and Wetlands
- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Prime and Unique Farmlands
- Wild and Scenic Rivers
- Telecommunications
- Solid Waste
- Potable Water
- Demographics
- Schools, Libraries and Recreational Facilities
- Environmental Justice

Therefore, impacts to these resources will not be addressed further by this EA.

5.1 Project Area

5.1.1 Geology

No significant adverse effects on geology would be expected to occur. Foreseeable improvements to the utilities infrastructure do not require any large earthmoving activity. In addition, the geologic conditions of the installation would not affect the rock and soil formation processes of the area.

5.1.2 Soils

(JAG Comment: *Should further expand on wetland and soil issues)*

Review of the Fort George G. Meade Soil Survey (Natural Resources Conservation Service, 1995) identified soils of statewide importance and prime farmland soils on the installation. Any action to be taken outside the established easements within one of these areas would have a negative impact on soil resources. Deed restrictions on the easement outgrant would reduce any foreseeable impacts to prime farmland soils due to upgrades and repairs to the existing infrastructure.

5.1.3 Topography and Drainage

The proposed action would not be expected to have a lasting or significant effect on the topography and drainage at Fort Meade. Any utility upgrade or replacement may temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements, but these disturbances would be restored to their existing grades when construction is complete. Expansion of the utilities systems outside the existing easements would be anticipated, but would require further environmental evaluation prior to implementation.

5.2 Air Quality

Implementation of the proposed action would transfer the responsibility for utilities operations from the Government to a non-Federal entity and would be expected to have no measurable impact on air quality in the Fort Meade area. Fort Meade currently receives electric and natural gas services from outside vendors, so the transfer of these services would be a paper transaction only. Furthermore, any proposed upgrade, expansion, or replacement would be performed to improve efficiency, provide for safety, or as a repair. Implementation of the proposed action is not expected to generate new emissions that would significantly affect air quality in the region. Construction activities associated with improvements to the existing transmission lines would result in short-term temporary emissions from construction vehicles and fugitive dust emissions. Fugitive dust from construction activities is generated from earth moving and wind erosion. Various types of construction equipment may be used for excavating and repairing old or installing new utility lines. Fugitive dust from construction would be contained on-site through approved construction control measures; therefore, no impacts to air quality are expected as a result of the proposed project. No foreseeable changes would be done to any of these systems in response to an increase in demand. Therefore, there would be no significant increase or decrease in air emissions in the project area as a result of the utility privatization.

5.3 Water Quality

Implementation of the proposed action is unlikely to have significant physical or chemical effects upon water quality resources at Fort Meade, as no work within the water itself is likely to occur as a result of the proposed action. Additionally, any utility system upgrades, expansion, repairs, and replacements would be conducted in compliance with Federal and state laws and regulations designed to protect water quality and other resources. The proposed action would not, of itself , increase demand nor result in a change in water quality at the installation.

5.4 Vegetation

It is Fort Meade's intent to comply with the spirit of the Maryland Forest Conservation Act and with Anne Arundel County Bill 13-90 (known as the "Tree Bill"). Deed restrictions on the easement outgrant would reduce any foreseeable impacts to forest conservation areas due to upgrades and repairs to the existing infrastructure. Other foreseeable secondary impacts on plant ecology include small-scale grass, herb, and shrub removal for gas line replacement. The impacts of this potential activity would not be expected to be significant, because no unique plant habitat types exist on the installation, and the habitat requirements for the urban type of vegetation found on Fort Meade are easily satisfied throughout the installation and surrounding areas. Wetland areas on Fort Meade are limited in range. Where existing utility systems already penetrate such areas, or where proposed utility realignments may eventually penetrate such areas, the non-Federal entity would be responsible to coordinate all construction activities with the appropriate installation DPW personnel so as to satisfy all required permits prior to initiation of any work. It is not expected that implementation of the proposed action will result in other than minor, temporary impacts to existing wetland areas.

5.5 Wildlife Resources

Wherever excavation or construction occurs, the utility contractor(s) would attempt to minimize the number of existing mature trees that are removed, because mature trees are ideal habitat for forest interior dwelling birds and small mammals. Because none of the vegetative habitats present on Fort Meade are unique to the installation, it is expected that the few urban birds and small mammals that may be found on any construction or excavation sites would relocate quickly to similar habitat available on the installation. Therefore, no significant effect is expected to the animal ecology of Fort Meade from either the granting of the easements and sale of the physical elements of the distribution systems, or from the anticipated replacement of the gas distribution systems.

5.6 Cultural Resources

The proposed action would involve the transfer of ownership and the responsibility to operate and maintain the E&G UDC systems on Fort Meade. The privatization of the UDC systems would have no physical effects on any aspect of the installation. The only foreseeable effects of the proposed action on these resources are secondary, specifically the effects of anticipated construction activity by the non-Federal entity to be responsible for upgrading, repairing or replacing the existing utility systems.

5.6.1 Archeological Resources

Land occupied by the existing utility system has been previously disturbed by the installation of the utility system and has little potential to contain archeological resources. Any action taken outside existing easements may impact archeological resources. Expansion of the utility outside the existing easements could disturb any undiscovered archeological sites that may be located on the installation. A Phase I archeological survey has been completed at Fort Meade so the known and the potential for unknown sites on the installation is well documented (Hornum et al, 1995; Hunter et al 1998). There are numerous archeological sites recorded at Fort Meade and avoidance would be the first strategy to preserve the known sites. If known sites must be impacted, on site monitoring during soil disturbing activities, or a data recovery excavation would be conducted as mitigation.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation with the Maryland SHPO has been initiated. A letter formally initiating consultation with the SHPO was sent on July 14, 1999. Follow-up correspondence transmitting this environmental assessment and its findings to the SHPO is being prepared. All correspondence resulting from consultation with the SHPO will be incorporated into the final version of this document.

5.6.2 Architectural Resources

As described in Section 5.6.1, Section 106 consultation with the Maryland SHPO has been initiated. The results of the consultation will be incorporated into the final version of this document.

5.7 Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Substances (HTRS)

Because the proposed action is expected not to change current operations and maintenance procedures at Fort Meade, no new sources of hazardous or toxic materials would be expected to occur from normal operations. Any unusual or accidental action that might result in the release of such materials would not be linked solely to the contractual implementation of the proposed privatization action. Prior to excavation, which may be required to expand/repair facilities, information regarding the known distribution and status of contaminated sites would need to be reviewed so that these improvements could be safely implemented. Therefore, no impacts would be anticipated from hazardous and toxic materials as a result of the proposed action.

5.8 Infrastructure

5.8.1 Utilities

Prior to contract award, the existing supply and service agreements between the Government and the various utility companies will need to be reviewed by the appropriate Government legal offices to ensure that they contain no clauses that would preclude or unduly hinder transfer of ownership, operation and maintenance of UDC systems under this privatization initiative. Certain existing contracts may need modification, or new contracts may need to be drafted to convey rights and easements to the Federal properties at Fort Meade. Although the full ramifications of these actions are not fully known, initial contact with representatives at Fort

Meade has indicated that no unresolvable issues are anticipated and that preparation of an easement(s) agreement should not be encumbered by pre-existing conditions.

Under certain circumstances, utility companies may have already obtained easements to construct and maintain infrastructure within the installation boundaries , but these utilities serve specially designated installation tenants or customers at locations outside the installation boundaries. Portions of the UDC systems within these existing easements are not part of this MDW privatization initiative.

5.8.1.1 Electric

BGE currently supplies electric power to the main substation on Fort Meade. Fort Meade then distributes this power to the individual use locations. As a result of the proposed action, the chosen utility contractor(s) would take on the responsibility for the distribution system within the Fort Meade installation. This is a transfer of ownership only, and no interruption in service is anticipated because of this action. Subsequent improvements to the electric distribution system may require brief power interruption as new cables are brought on-line. These disruptions would most likely be pre-arranged, should they be necessary, thus reducing their impact. Therefore, no significant impact is expected to electrical supply or distribution.

5.8.1.2 Natural Gas

BGE currently supplies natural gas to Fort Meade. Fort Meade then distributes the gas via underground pipes to the individual use locations. As a result of the proposed action, Fort Meade would abandon the existing gas distribution system in place. The chosen utility contractor(s) would construct a new distribution system, and would take on the responsibility for operating and maintaining this system within the Fort Meade installation. Replacement of the natural gas distribution system may require brief service interruption as new pipes are brought on-line. These disruptions would most likely be pre-arranged, should they be necessary, thus reducing their impact. Therefore, no significant impact is expected to natural gas supply or distribution.

5.8.2 Traffic and Transportation

Minor increases in traffic volume would be expected as a result of implementing the proposed action. Traffic volume, however, would be anticipated to involve few vehicles (those of construction crewmembers, those of the utility non-Federal entity's engineers) would be temporary. No increase in traffic would be anticipated as a result of the proposed action. Therefore, no significant traffic impact would be anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

5.9 Socioeconomic Conditions

5.9.1 Economics

The foreseeable impact of implementation of the proposed action is the economic impacts of privatization, which would be expected to be minor. The Government will prepare an economic analysis of the apparent best-value prospective offer in order to determine if the proposed privatization action shows a positive life-cycle cost. Subsequently, assuming requisite DOD and Congressional approval is given to award a contract, the successful non-Federal entity, as the outright owner of the Meade E&G UDC systems, would become fiscally responsible for their

maintenance and operation, to include implementing necessary infrastructure repairs, upgrades or replacement work. As many as ten full-time equivalent (FTE) positions in the current DPW workforce could be expected to be affected by the loss of operation and maintenance responsibilities under the proposed action. All or some of these employees could be subject to reassignment to different duties or possibly termination of employment. The potential layoffs would be expected to have minor economic impact in the area of Fort Meade. According to recent aggregate employment and payroll statistics at Fort Meade, the average annual full time salary equals $41,200 (total payroll -- $1.4 Billion divided by estimated 34,000 civilian / military employees) Therefore, it is generally estimated that the loss of ten personnel would represent a loss of approximately $412,000 per year in salary expenditures for employees in the county. It is expected, however, that these employees would receive favorable consideration for employment from the non-Federal entity.

Other, minor economic effects of the proposed action include expected, short-term increases in construction expenditures associated with improvements to the Meade E&G UDC systems infrastructure. The non-Federal entity can be expected to move forward to implement infrastructure improvements sooner than the Government would have been able to program and fund. On the basis of relationships found in the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, it can be estimated that about 39 percent of the total construction expenditure would be spent on labor, and 61 percent would be spent on materials and supplies.

A sufficient construction labor force exists in the county and surrounding jurisdictions to supply the potential demand created by the proposed action without requiring construction workers to relocate from outside the area. Secondary economic effects may include employment and sales in sectors of the economy that benefit from the existence of additional workers (for example, restaurants and gasoline stations). Direct and indirect economic effects of the potential loss of the ten FTEs, the potential construction expenditures, and the short-term increase in construction employment are not expected to represent a significant change in the local economy.

5.9.2 Public Health and Safety

Granting of the utilities easements, abandoning the existing gas distribution system in place, and performing any construction and excavation activities would not have any adverse effects on police or fire service, nor on any other emergency services on Fort Meade. The proposed action would not result in an increase in personnel, nor would they involve a change in mission or activities at Fort Meade. Therefore, no threat to public health or safety is anticipated by the proposed action.

5.9.3 Noise

Implementation of the proposed action would not have a significant effect upon existing noise levels. Currently, Fort Meade receives electric and natural gas service from outside vendors. The transfer of these services would be a paper transaction only. Any utility upgrade or replacement might temporarily effect a small area within the existing easements and would be performed to improve efficiency, provide for safety, or as a repair. It is expected that noise levels associated with this construction would be temporary and minor.

5.9.4 Visual and Aesthetic Values

The proposed privatization is a transfer of ownership only. Any physical construction occurring within the easements to be granted for the proposed action is covered by this EA. Any potential work outside the easements to be granted would have to be approved, and would be subject to additional environmental, regulatory, or installation ordinances. It is expected that only minimal, temporary effects on Fort Meade's visual or aesthetic values would result from the proposed action. Once any construction is complete, the visual and aesthetic values would be restored to their previous condition, as coordinated with the Government.

5.10 Cumulative Impacts

5.10.1 Impacts on the Natural Environment

The proposed action would result in the transfer of ownership of the electric and natural gas distribution systems to the successful non-Federal entity. It will also transfer responsibility to this entity to repair, upgrade or replace the existing utilities infrastructure within an expected period of 3 to 5 years, so as to be able to operate and maintain these systems to necessary, prescribed industry standards. This action would not be expected to have cumulative physical or chemical effects on any aspect of the installation, nor on installation command or mission. Foreseeable effects of the proposed action on these resources would be considered secondary, specifically the effects of temporary construction activities associated with the upgrade, repair, or replacement of all or parts of the Meade E&G UDC systems.

Potential future utilities improvements, including expansion or upgrade of these UDC systems, would most likely have impacts on soils and local air quality. These effects are not likely to be large, either singly or cumulatively. Additionally, deed restrictions on the easement outgrant would reduce any foreseeable impacts to: (1) water supply and quality, (2) prime farmland soils, (3) forest conservation areas, (4) aquatic resources, (5) wetlands, (6) threatened and endangered species, and (7) cultural resources due to upgrades and repairs to the existing infrastructure. This reduction of the impact of each part of the proposed action would reduce the overall cumulative impact of all foreseeable parts to within reasonable limits.

Other current proposed projects for Fort George G. Meade include: (1) the renovation and replacement of Army Family Housing installation-wide under the Army's Residential Communities Initiative, (2) construction of a consolidated Emergency Services Center, (3) construction of a Phase 1 Barracks, (4) construction of a Criminal Investigation Command building, (5) construction of a Military Entrance and Processing Station and (6) Water and Wastewater privatization initiatives. Each of these proposed actions has included preparation of the appropriate environmental documentation, in accordance with NEPA statutes and Department of Army regulations.

All of the proposed projects as described in the above-referenced environmental documentation, would comply with applicable state, county, and local laws and regulations. Best management practices would be used to control sediment, erosion, and fugitive dust during construction for all Fort Meade projects. None of the proposed projects is expected to have any significant or cumulative adverse effects on any environmental resources on Fort Meade.

5.10.2 Impacts on the Human Environment

The privatization of the natural gas and electric distribution systems may, in the worst-case scenario, result in the loss of ten FTEs from Fort Meade's payroll. These individuals would be provided with the job placement services available to them through Fort Meade. Under ideal conditions, each individual would be able to find comparable employment with no break in pay or benefits. In less than ideal conditions, some individuals would not be able to find suitable employment within the severance period. This situation, however, is not permanent, and the cumulative economic impacts of temporary unemployment are not likely to be significant.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

This EA addressed the privatization of the electric and natural gas utility distribution (Meade E&G UDC) systems on the Fort Meade installation. The proposed action and the no-action alternative have been reviewed in accordance with NEPA, as implemented by the regulations of the CEQ and AR 200-2. Baseline environmental and socio-economic conditions at Fort Meade and the surrounding areas have been described, and the environmental and socio-economic consequences of implementing the proposed actions, have been evaluated. A table summarizing the effects of the proposed action and the no-action alternative on environmental resources, as documented in detail in Section 5.0, is provided below.

Table 6-1. Summary of Effects of Proposed Actions and Alternatives

Resource	Proposed Action	No-Action Alternative
Land Use	No Impact.	No Impact.
Geology	No Impact.	No Impact.
Soils	No Impact.	No Impact.
Topography and Drainage	No Impact.	No Impact.
Climate	No Impact.	No Impact.
Air Quality	No Impact.	No Impact.
Water Quality	No Impact.	No Impact.
Aquatic Resources and Wetlands	No Impact.	No Impact.
Vegetation	No Impact.	No Impact.
Wildlife Resources	No Impact.	No Impact.
Threatened and Endangered Species	No Impact.	No Impact.
Prime and Unique Farmlands	No Impact.	No Impact.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No Impact.	No Impact.
Cultural Resources	No Impact.	No Impact.
Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Substances	No Impact.	No Impact.
Infrastructure	No Impact.	No Impact.
Solid Waste	No Impact.	No Impact.
Transportation	Temporary, minor impacts.	No Impact.
Economics	Minor impacts.	No Impact.
Public Health and Safety	No Impact.	No Impact.
Noise	No Impact.	No Impact.
Environmental Justice	No Impact.	No Impact.

Department of Defense (DoD) has directed, and Department of the Army (DA) has issued implementing guidance to major commands and subordinate installations, to pursue privatization of UDC systems as a prudent means to transfer the responsibility of ownership, operation, and

maintenance of these systems to the non-Federal sector. Privatization of UDC systems is envisioned as the means for the military services to obtain more efficient delivery of utility services and to be able to standardize maintenance and operation of these systems as commonly applicable and prescribed in the non-Federal sector. Fort Meade's aging E&G UDC system infrastructure is in need of repair, upgrade and/or replacement. Through privatization of its UDC systems, the Government would be able to effect these infrastructure improvements as timely as possible. For these reasons, the Government is pursuing privatization of its Meade E&G UDC systems at this time.

Selection of the no-action alternative, or not privatizing the Meade E&G UDC systems, would not satisfy the need to provide capital improvements to those entire existing systems or portions of those systems in poor condition, nor would it comply with DoD directives and DA policy to privatize UDC systems to the maximum extent. Therefore, the no-action alternative is not preferred.

Impacts to natural resources from implementing the proposed action would be expected to be minor, and be primarily associated with UDC systems infrastructure repair or replacement. Short-term impacts consisting of dust and emissions, soil disturbance, equipment noise and damage to vegetation can be expected within the utility line easements from the use of construction equipment. Implementing the proposed action would be expected to shorten the overall duration of construction activities that would have had to have been performed by the Government to keep the UDC systems in satisfactory operation. As such, no long-term impact and, collectively, no significant impact on natural resources is anticipated.

Impacts to cultural resources from implementing the proposed action are likely to be minor, and temporary. No impacts are expected to historic structures, as no infrastructure work would be performed within any building footprint. Ground disturbance, even within existing utility easements, has the potential for uncovering archaeological or historically significant artifacts. The non-Federal owner would be required to comply with all installation guidelines and procedures for managing and protecting cultural resources prior to initiating any excavation or other disturbance of the ground. As such, no significant impacts are expected to the architectural, visual and aesthetic features within the overall Fort Meade listed and eligible historic district.

Impacts to socio-economic conditions from implementing the proposed action would be expected to be minor, and associated with the potential loss of operations and maintenance personnel positions and minor impact of infrastructure construction expenditures. Privatization of the Meade E&G UDC systems may result in the loss of as many as ten FTE personnel from the installation's Department of Public Works (DPW) workforce. These individuals would be provided with job placement services available. Under ideal conditions, each individual would be able to find comparable employment with no break in pay or benefits. In less than ideal conditions, some individuals would not be able to find suitable employment within the severance period. This situation, however, is not permanent, and the cumulative economic impacts of temporary unemployment are not likely to be significant. Short-term increases in construction expenditures associated with infrastructure improvements on Fort Meade are not expected to represent a significant change in the local economy, considering the level of construction activity present and anticipated in the surrounding area.

The implementation of the proposed action consists of transfer of ownership of Meade E&G UDC systems, and transfer of responsibility to operate and maintain these systems, from the Federal Government to a non-Federal entity. Implementing the proposed action to privatize Meade UDC systems would not significantly alter baseline environmental or socio-economic conditions. Because the proposed action would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, no environmental impact statement will be prepared, and a Finding of No Significant Impact will be published in accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500 and Army Regulation 200-2.

7.0 REFERENCES

Anne Arundel County. 1992. *County Planning Area Demographic Profiles, 1990 Census.*

Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning. 1993. *Anne Arundel County Major Statistics, 1980-2020*. Annapolis, Maryland.

CH2M Hill, Inc. 1999. *Environmental Baseline Survey For the Residential Communities Initiative (RCI) at Fort George G. Meade.* Draft Report. Prepared for the U.S. Army Military District of Washington, Housing Privatization Initiatives Office, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.

CH2M Hill, Inc. 1996. *Environmental Assessment, Fort Meade Development Projects Through 1998*, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland

Census Bureau. 1990 Census CD-ROM Lookup (Census Web Site).

Council on Environmental Quality. 1996. *Draft Guidance for Addressing Environmental Justice Under the National Environmental Policy Act. Preliminary Draft.* May 24, 1996.

Department of the Army. 1998. *Draft Management Plan for Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste.* Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.

EcoScience Professionals. 1994. *Natural Heritage Survey of Critical Habitats, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.*

Fort George G. Meade. 1991. *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Comprehensive Base Realignment and Partial Closure for Fort Meade and Fort Holabird.* Prepared by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District.

Fort George G. Meade. 1998. *Draft Pest Management Plan for Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.*. Prepared by Installation Pest Management Coordinator, Directorate of Public Works for Fort Meade.

Gardner, M. W., G. Harnes, D. Curry, and M. Stewart. 1977. *A Cultural Resources Reconnaissance of Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Surface Reconnaissance Phase*. Thunderbird Research Corporation: Front Royal, Virginia.

Geomet Technologies, Inc. *Air Pollution Emission Statement for Fort Meade, Maryland.* November 30, 1993.

Goodwin, R. Christopher, H. McAloon, J. Minze, et al. 1994. *Fort George G. Meade Cultural Resource Management Plan. Final Report.* Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, by R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates, Inc. Frederick, Maryland.

Hornum, Michael B., K. Saul, and T. Majorov. 1995. *Phase I Archeological Survey of Approximately 2,210 Acres at Fort George G. Meade, Anne Arundel County, Maryland*. Final Report (Technical Appendix to the Fort George G. Meade Cultural Resource Management Plan). Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, by R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates, Inc. Frederick, Maryland.

Hunter, Richard and S. Ferenbach. 1998. *Supplementary Phase I Archeological Investigation, Fort George G. Meade, Anne Arundel County, Maryland*. Final Report. Prepared for Fort G. Meade by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District.

Kamber Engineering. 1991. *Water Quality Evaluation and Recommendations Report, Midway Branch and Franklin Branch, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland (Volume I).*

Kuranda, Kathryn, K. Grandine, and W. P. Giglio. 1996. *Fort George G. Meade Phase II Architectural Summary Report*. Final Report. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, by R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates, Frederick, Maryland.

Mach, F. K., and G. Achmad. 1986. *Evaluation of the Water-Supply Potential of Aquifers in the Potomac Group of Anne Arundel County, Maryland. Report of Investigation No. 46.* Prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey and Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning.

Maryland Department of the Environment, Air Management Administration. 1993. *Maryland Air Quality Data Report.*

Maryland Department of Natural Resources. 1987. *The Quantity and Natural Quality of Ground Water in Maryland.* Prepared by the Maryland Water Resources Administration.

Maryland Department of Natural Resources. 1989. *Wetland Maps.* Prepared by the Maryland Water Resources Administration.

Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1995. *Fort George G. Meade Soil Survey*.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District. 1991. *Installation Spill Contingency Plan. Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.*

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District. 1991. *Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan. Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.*

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Construction Engineering Research Laboratory. 1991. *Technical Report N-91/03, Hazardous Waste Minimization Assessment: Fort Meade, Maryland.*

U.S. Army Military District of Washington. 1999. *Final Consolidated Utility Privatization Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Privatization of the National Capital Region Utility Distribution Systems.* Contracting Agent – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District.

U.S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency. 1989. *Enhanced Preliminary Assessment Report. Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.*

U.S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency. 1990. *Technical Report for Proposed Ordnance Clearance at Fort George G. Meade (Draft Final).*

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1991. *Supplement A to Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors Volume II: Mobile Sources; AP-42, Supplement A.*

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1995. *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors Volume I: Stationary Point and Area Sources; AP-42, Fifth Edition.*

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Science Center. 1994. *Environmental Assessment. Final.*

Versar Incorporated. 1999. *Future Development and Operations Environmental Assessment, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland.* Final Report. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Baltimore, Maryland

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
AR	Army Regulation
ARRP	Army Radon Reduction Program
AST	Aboveground Storage Tank
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
BGE	Baltimore Gas and Electric
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CRMP	Cultural Resource Management Plan
DINFOS	Defense Information School
DoD	Department of Defense
DPW	Directorate of Public Works
DRID	Defense Reform Initiative Directive
EA	Environmental Assessment
EBS	Environmental Baseline Survey
EMO	Environmental Management Office
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ETL	Engineering Technical Letter
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FNSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
FWS	Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service
FY	Fiscal Year
HAZMAT	Hazardous Material
HTRS	Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Substances
ISCP	Installation Spill Contingency Plan
LBP	Lead Based Paint
MD DNR	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
MDE	Maryland Department of the Environment
MDW	Military District of Washington
Mg/L	Milligrams Per Liter
MGD	Million Gallons Per Day
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheet
MSL	Mean Sea Level
MTA	Maryland Transportation Authority
NCR	National Capital Region
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESC	National Electric Safety Code
NESHAP	National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NO_2	Nitrogen Dioxide
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSA	National Security Agency
O_3	Ozone

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations (con't)

PA	Programmatic Agreement
Pb	Lead
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PCi/L	Picocuries Per Liter
PM-10	Particulate Matter-10 Microns
POC	Point of Contact
PPM	Parts Per Million
PVC	Poly-Vinyl Chloride
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RFP	Request for Proposal
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SO_2	Sulfur Dioxide
USAR	United States Army Reserve
USC	United States Code
UST	Underground Storage Tank